

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Appellants:	Stephen R. Van Doren et al.	§	Confirmation No.:	5314
Serial No.:	10/758,352	§	Group Art Unit:	2186
Filed:	01/15/2004	§	Examiner:	Ryan A. Dare
For:	Transaction References For Requests In A Multi-Processor Network	§	Docket No.:	200313750-1

**RESPONSE TO NOTIFICATION OF
NON-COMPLIANT APPEAL BRIEF (37 CFR 41.37)**

Mail Stop Appeal Brief – Patents
Commissioner for Patents
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Date: April 20, 2010

Sir:

Appellants received a Notice of Non-Compliant Appeal Brief dated March 22, 2010, in which the Examiner alleged Appellants' Brief lacks a Summary in compliance with 37 CFR(c)(1)(v). The Examiner, however, did not specifically state what is deemed to be defective about the Summary. Over a phone conversation, the Examiner indicated that the dependent claims that were separately argued should be summarized. The rule cited above only requires dependent claims that contain "means plus function" limitations to be summarized, which Appellants have followed (dependent claim 34). No other dependent claim is required to be summarized. Thus, Appellants' Brief is in full compliance with the applicable Rule.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jonathan M. Harris/

Jonathan M. Harris
PTO Reg. No. 44,144
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.
(713) 238-8000 (Phone)
(713) 238-8008 (Fax)
ATTORNEY FOR APPELLANTS

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
Legal Dept., M/S 35
3404 E. Harmony Road
Fort Collins, CO 80528-9599